Fuller Theological Seminary

TH511: SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY I   Theology and Anthropology

Dr. Colin Brown
Revised Spring Quarter, 1985.

For a list of recommended books on the general area of this course see the
Course Description. Books and articles noted below are listed for guidance in
following up particular subjects and in preparation of papers.

I.   Revelation, Authority and Method

1.   Reformed Orthodoxy and the Sola Scriptura Principle

The continental Reformation in the sixteenth century began as a debate on
abuses but rapidly became a conflict over authority in the church. Out of it
emerged the Protestant principle of appealing to Scripture alone as the Word
of God by which all matters of faith and conduct should be settled.   The
classic Reformed tradition stands over against that of the Spiritualists and
Quakers with their claim to immediate divine inspiration and revelation and
that of the Church of Rome with its claim to be the living guardian and inter-
preter of divine revelation.

R. Bainton, "The Bible in the Reformation," in S. L. Greenslade, ed., The
Cambridge History of the Bible, III, Cambridge University Press, 1963, 1-37;
J. Dillenberger, ed., Martin Luther: Selections from his Writings, Garden
City: Anchor, 1961; John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (1559),
ed. J. T. McNeill, Philadelphia: Westminster, The Library of Christian
Classics, XX, 1961, 1, 1-10; J. K. S. Reid, The Authority of Scripture: A
Study of the Reformation and Post-Reformation Understanding of the Bible,
London: Methuen, 1957; J. B. Rogers, Scripture in the Westminster Confession:
A Problem of Historical Interpretation for American Presbyterianism, Grand
Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967; G. H. Tavard, Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis
of the Protestant Reformation, New York: Harper, 1959; Y. M. - J. Congar,
Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Historical Essay, London:
Burns and Oates, 1966; F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp, eds., Holy Book and Holy
Tradition, Manchester University Press, 1968; C. Brown, "The Teaching Office
of the Church," The Churchman 83, 1969, 184-196; A. Flannery, ed., Vatican II:
The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents, Costello, 1975; P. Schaff, The
Creeds of Christendom, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977, II, 79ff., 234-271; III,
58-72, 689ff., 500, 600-606.

2.   Neo-Orthodoxy

Nineteenth-century liberalism questioned whether the Bible could be re-
garded as the Word of God and saw it rather as the historically and culturally
conditioned response of man to the transcendent. The Dialectical Theology of
the 1920s and 1930s thought of God as "Wholly Other" and Scripture as the me-
dium of encounter. Bultmann combined this view of God with a historical scep-
ticism which resulted in a form of existentialism. Brunner developed a the-
ology of encounter, and Barth worked out a theology of revelation in which all
God's dealings with men are effected in and through the person of Jesus
Christ. In it Scripture is the "witness" through which we apprehend Christ.

Tillich's position was radically different. Rejecting the idea of God as a transcendent Being, he preferred to speak of the Ground of Being or Being itself. We become aware of the Ground of our Being through an "ontological shock." It is mediated through symbols.

R. Bultmann, "The Concept of Revelation in the New Testament," in Existence and Faith, New York: Living Age Books and London: Collins Fontana, 1964, 67-106; "New Testament and Mythology," in H. W. Bartsch, ed., Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate, vols., I and II combined, London: SPCK, 1972, 1-44; W. Schmithals, An Introduction to the Theology of Rudolf Bultmann, London: SCM, 1968, 147-194; C. Brown, "Bultmann Revisited," The Churchman, 88, 1974, 167-187; H. P. Owen, The Christian Knowledge of God, London: Athlone, 1969.

E. Bruner, Revelation and Reason, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946; E. Brunner, Truth as Encounter: A New Edition, Much Enlarged of The Divine-Human Encounter, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964; P. K. Jewett, Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation, London: James Clarke, 1954; P. K. Jewett, Emil Brunner: An Introduction to the Man and His Thought, Chicago: Inter Varsity, 1961; K. Barth, Church Dogmatics, I, 1 (2nd ed.) and I, 2, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975 and 1956; C. Brown, Karl Barth and the Christian Message, London: Inter Varsity, 1967, 30-76; P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, I, University of Chicago, 1951; P. Tillich, "The Meaning and Justification of Religious Symbols," in S. Hook, ed., Religious Experience and Truth: A Symposium, New York and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962, 3-11.

3.   Contemporary Evangelicalism

     In the nineteenth century the Reformed doctrine of Scripture came to be identified with the doctrine of verbal inerrancy. This was in part due to the influence of the Princeton school of theology which in turn was influenced by Aristotelian logic and the Scottish Common Sense school of philosophy. On the one hand, this position has been attacked by those who say that it is incompatible with a historical understanding of Scripture and the intentions and methods of the biblical writers themselves. On the other hand, its advocates claim that verbal inerrancy is implied by the attitude of Jesus and that once the doctrine is abandoned the way is open to every form of liberalism.

C. H. Pinnock, Biblical Revelation: The Foundation of Christian Theology, Chicago: Moody Press, 1971; J. Barr, Fundamentalism, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978; D. H. Kelsey, The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975; B. B. Warfield, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1951; J. I. Packer, "Fundamentalism" and the Word of God, London: Inter Varsity, 1958; H. Lindsell, The Battle for the Bible, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976; C. F. H. Henry, God, Revelation and Authority, I-II, Waco: Word Books, 1976; J. B. Rogers, ed., Biblical Authority, Waco: Word Books, 1977.

4.   Revelation in Nature, History and Experience

     Is Scripture the sole source of revelation? Aquinas took Rom. 1:19f. as a warrant for arguments designed to prove the existence of God. Calvin spoke of man's sense of the divinity, but claimed that sin had so debilitated it

that it led to no clear knowledge of God. Barth went even further, claiming that we have no knowledge of God at all apart from that which is mediated by the Word of God. But if the natural man has no knowledge of God, how can he be held guilty before God? If he has some knowledge of God apart from saving revelation, how does it work and what is its extent? Pannenberg has criticized twentieth-century theologies of the Word for being too narrow, and has claimed that universal history is the medium of divine revelation. Others, like J. Macquarrie, have tried to develop an existential ontology based on phenomenonology.

E. Brunner and K. Barth, Natural Theology, London: Bles, 1946; C. Brown, Karl Barth and the Christian Message, London: Inter Varsity, 1967, 77-98; R. Bultmann, "The Problem of 'Natural Theology,'" in Faith and Understanding: Collected Essays, London: SCM, 1969, 313-331; G. Bornkamm, "The Revelation of God's Wrath (Romans 1-3)," in Early Christian Experience, London: SCM, 1969, 47-70; E. L. Mascall, The Openness of Being: Natural Theology Today, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971; J. Macquarrie, Principles of Christian Theology, London: SCM, 2nd ed., 1977, 1-36, 75-93; C. C. J. Webb, Studies in the History of Natural Theology, Oxford University Press, (1915) 1970; W. Pannenberg, ed., Revelation as History, London: Sheed and Ward, 1969; W. Pannenberg, Basic Questions in Theology, I, London: SCM, 1970; E. F. Tupper, The Theology of Wolfhart Pannenberg, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973; G. C. Berkouwer, General Revelation, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

II. The Doctrine of God

1. Classical Theism

Classical theism frequently employs terms like divine substance, immutability, aseity, simplicity, person, communicable and incommunicable attributes. Such concepts were in part taken over from Greek philosophy and were used to articulate the faith of the church. Orthodoxy has been accused of superimposing a rationalistic, philosophical structure upon biblical teaching, and of reducing experience of the living God to sterile abstractions. An examination of this charge.

H. Bavinck, The Doctrine of God (1918), Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977; J. K. Mozley, The Impassibility of God: A Survey of Christian Thought, Cambridge University Press, 1926; H. Heppe, Reformed Dogmatics, Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources, London: Allen and Unwin, 1950, 57-104; C. Stead, Divine Substance, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977; N. Pike, God and Timelessness, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970; E. L. Mascall, The Openness of Being: Natural Theology Today, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971, 158-174; E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God, Dogmatics I, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950, 117-302; F. R. Tennant, Philosophical Theology, II, Cambridge, 1937, 121-179; Ronald H. Nash, The Concept of God, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983; R. Swinburne, The Existence of God, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979; R. Swinburne, The Coherence of Theism, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

2. Alternatives to Christian Theism

The closing years of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries witnessed a protest against tradition theism and against enlightened rationalism. Philosophers, writers and theologians of the romantic Movement

and Idealism revived Spinoza's pantheism and stressed divine immanence. Schleiermacher restated Christian theology on the basis of man's religious experience as a dependent being. His teaching sought to outlank Kant's embargo on metaphysics and to avoid basing theology on the Bible as special revelation. Hegel's philosophy of Spirit saw reality as the expression of the outworking of the Absolute Spirit.

In the twentieth century several thinkers have restated philosophical theologies along the basic lines of idealism. Paul Tillich's existential ontology describes God in terms of the Ground of our Being or Being itself. It expressly rejects "supranaturalism." John Macquarrie uses Husserl's phenomenology and Heidegger's existentialism to interpret God as "Being-letting-be." Process theology makes use of A. N. Whitehead's concept of process and God as both the Ground and Goal of existence. God and the world are correlative; God is the process of becoming.

F. E. D. Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith (Eng. tr. 1928), New York: Harper, 1963; R. R. Williams, Schleiermacher the Theologian: The Construction of the Doctrine of God, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978; P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, I, Chicago University Press, 1951; A. N. Whitehead, Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology, Corrected Edition edited by D. R. Griffin and R. W. Sherburne, New York: Free Press, 1979; C. Hartshorne, "Whitehead's Idea of God," in P. A. Schilpp, ed., The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University, 1941, 515-559; J. B. Cobb, Jr., A Christian Natural Theology based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965; J. B. Cobb, Jr., and D. R. Griffin, Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976; E. L. Mascall, ibid.; N. Pittenger, God in Process, London: SCM, 1967; N. Pittenger, "Process Theology," in A. Richardson, ed., A Dictionary of Christian Theology, London: SCM, 1969, 275ff.; N. Pittenger, The Divine Triunity, Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1977; H. P. Owen, Concepts of Deity, New York: Herder, 1971; J. Macquarrie, op. cit.; and Thinking about God, New York: Harper, 1975.

3. Christian Theism Restated

In the hey-day of Dialectical Theology Karl Barth and Emil Brunner took as their starting point the idea that God is "Wholly Other" (totaliter aliter). He exists on a different plane and in a different mode from us. We know him only as he makes himself known in revelation. Brunner developed this idea in terms of a personal theism. Barth became increasingly christocentric. Underlying his teaching is the thought that Jesus Christ is God's Word to man. All God's dealings with men are effected in and through him. In virtue of the union of divine and human natures in Jesus Christ and the history that took place in him Barth speaks of the covenant between God and man. For Barth the basic attribute of God is his "humanity," the fact that he shows himself to be the kind of God who takes man into covenant partnership with himself. Creation took place in order to realize this covenant. In Jesus Christ God has reconciled all to himself.

In moving from the idea of God as "Wholly Other" to the "humanity of God" Barth's theology appears to have turned a full circle. But his theology preserves the fundamental distinction between God and his creation, and from first to last knowledge of God is possible only by the self-revelation of God in Christ.

T. F. Torrance is a theologian who is deeply indebted to Barth. In his later writings he has been concerned to show that a Barthian approach to the knowledge of God is fully compatible with the methodology of natural science. In both cases the object of knowledge determines the method. By contrast, Torrance claims that those theologies which begin with a pre-conceived philosophy of being which thus determines our concept of God are based on a defective theological method.

Neo-Thomists like B. Lonergan and E. L. Masxall argue that there should be no sharp contrast between natural and special revelation. Both these are ways of knowing the one God. Without a natural theology, they claim that revealed theology is in a vacuum. They claim that the structuredness of the physical world points to the God of Christian theism.

E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of God, Dogmatics I, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950; K. Barth, Church Dogmatics, II, 1 and 2, The Doctrine of God, Edinburgh; T. & T. Clark, 1957 (see especially II, 2, 3-506); K. Barth, "The Humanity of God," in God, Grace and Gospel, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 8, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959, 29-52; C. Brown, Karl Barth and the Christian Message, London: Inter Varsity, 1967, 99-139, 149-153; T. F. Torrance, Theological Science, Oxford University Press, 1969; T. F. Torrance, God and Rationality, Oxford University Press, 1971; T. F. Torrance, "Newton, Einstein and Scientific Theology," Religious Studies 8, 1972, 233-250, reprinted in Transformation and Convergence in Its Frame of Knowledge. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984; B. Lonergan, "Natural Knowledge of God," in A Second Collection, Philadelphia: Westminister, 1974, 117-134; B. Lonergan, Method in Theology, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972; B. Lonergan, Philosophy of God and Theology, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973; B. Tyrrell, Bernard Lonergan's Philosophy of God, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1976; E. L. Mascall, The Openness of Being: Natural Theology Today, 1971; H. Thielicke, The Evangelical Faith: II The Doctrine of God and Christ, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977; J. Lewis, ed., Beyond Chance and Necessity, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1974.

4.   The Doctrine of the Trinity

The Greek Fathers were apt to speak of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit as a descending hierarchy. Origenism led to Arianism which claimed that the Logos was an intermediary being between God and man. The Council of Nicea (325) affirmed that he was of the same substance as the Father. The Council of Chalcedon (451) attempted to define more precisely the humanity and divinity of Christ and the relations of the Father, Son and Spirit. Augustine abandoned the Greek idea of the priority of the Father and asserted the co-eternity of all three persons. Believing that God had left imprints on his divine nature on his creation (vestigia trinitatis), Augustine claimed to see analogies of the Trinity in the mind's knowledge of itself through itself and the mind's love of itself through itself. However, Augustine's analogies seem to depend on the validity of a Platonic view of the mind.

Many modern thinkers effectively dissolve the doctrine of the Trinity. In speaking of Jesus as "the Bearer of the New Being," Tillich revives Schleiermacher's view that Jesus was a man in whom God dwelt, so that one could speak of an existence of God in humanity. For Tillich Jesus was a man

who was rightly related to the Ground of his being and who thus could mediate
this reality to others.   G. W. H. Lampe rejects the metaphysics of three
divine persons and prefers to speak of the Spirit as God himself in personal
relation with his creation.   The incarnation is a union of God with man in
which the characteristic qualities of divine action find full expression in a
human personality without detracting from its freedom.

On the other hand, Barth has attempted to vindicate the doctrine of the
Trinity by grounding it on revelation.   God reveals himself as the Father
through the Son in the power of the Holy Spirit.   Barth prefers to speak of
the Father, Son and Spirit as three "modes of being" (Seinsweisen), or three
ways in which God is God.   He distinguishes this from the early church heresy
of modalism on the grounds that in modalism the three "persons" were merely
temporary modes or manifestations of the one divine being.   Barth maintains
that God is always in time and in himself Father, Son and Spirit.   He argues,
moreover, that his principle of knowledge is nothing less than the Trinity.
It is not Scripture as such but God himself in his movement towards man in his
triune being.   Consequently Barth treats the doctrine of the Trinity as part
of the Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics.

Other modern restatements of the doctrine include the "social analogy" theory
of Leonard Hodgson (which in contrast to Barth begins with the three persons
and works towards their unity, whereas Barth begins with the unity of the
Trinity), Karl Rahner's Catholic restatement and E. Jüngel's of God's Being in
Becoming.

A. E. J. Rawlinson, ed., Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, London:
Longmans, 1933; G. A. F. Knight, A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the
Trinity, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 1, Edinburgh: Olive
and Boyd, 1953; A. W. Wainwright, The Trinity in the New Testament, London:
SPCK, 1962; P. Schaff, op. cit., II, 11-73; Augustine, The Trinity (abridged
translation in J. Burnaby, ed., Augustine: Later Works, Library of Christian
Classics VIII, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1955, 17-181); E. J. Fortman, The
Triune God: A Historical Study of the Doctrine of the Trinity, Philadelphia:
Westminister, 1972; P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, II, Chicago University
Press, 1957; G. W. H. Lampe, God as Spirit, The Bampton Lectures, 1976,
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977; J. D. G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit: A Study
of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians
as Reflected in the New Testament, London: SCM, 1975; Karl Barth, Church
Dogmatics, I, 1, 2nd ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 295-489; L.
Hodgson, The Doctrine of the Trinity, Digswell Place: Nisbet, 1943; R. S.
Franks, The Doctrine of the Trinity, London: Duckworth, 1953; C. Welch, The
Trinity in Contemporary Theology, London: SCM, 1953; K. Rahner, The Trinity,
New York: Seabury, 1974; E. Jüngel, The Doctrine of the Trinity: God's Being
is in Becoming, Monograph Supplements to the Scottish Journal of Theology 4,
Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1976; J. Moltmann, The Trinity
and the Kingdom, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981; P. Toon and J. D.
Spiceland, eds., One God in Trinity, Westchester, Ill.: Cornerstone Books,
1980.

III. The Doctrine of Creation

1.   The Concept of Creation

     The philosophical background and implications of the concept of creation.

The biblical picture of God's relationship with the world and the interpretation of the Genesis creation narratives. Is Ge. 1-3 intended to give a descriptive account of the course of events? The biblical account of creation and the scientific world-view. Creatio ex nihilo.

Aquinas maintained that the physical world pointed to the existence of the Creator-God who is the continuing cause of all things. He is ever present to his creation, because a cause is present wherever it is active. Heb. 11:3 presents creation as a faith-doctrine. Karl Barth goes even further and interprets creation christologically. The world was created to make the covenant relationship of God and man in Christ technically possible. To Brunner, Barth has erected a new form of natural theology on the basis of a biblical core.

The concept of creation contrasts with the ontologies of Tillich, Macquarrie and Process Theology which, in varying degrees, have affinities with gnostic emanations.

N. H. Ridderbos, Is there a Conflict between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957; C. Westermann, Creation, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974; H. Renckens, Israel's Concept of the Beginning: The Theology of Genesis 1-3, New York: Herder, 1964; A. Ehrhardt, The Beginning: A Study in the Greek Philosophical Approach to the Concept of Creation from Anaximander to St. John, Manchester University Press, 1968; Aquinas, Summa Theologiae I, 44-45; H. Heppe, op. cit., 190-200; J. G. Gibbs, Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 26, Leiden: Brill, 1971; K. Barth, Church Dogmatics, III, 1, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958; E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of Creation, Dogmatics II, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953, 3-45; I. G. Barbour, Issues in Science and Religion, New York: Harper, 1968; I. G. Barbour, Myths, Models and Paradigms, New York: Harper, 1974; E. L. Mascall, Christian Theology and Natural Science: Some Questions in their Relations, London: Longmans, Green, 1956; A. R. Peacocke, Science and the Christian Experiment, Oxford University Press, 1971; idem, Creation and the World of Science, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979; C. A. Russell, ed., Science and Religious Belief: A Selection of Recent Historical Studies, University of London, 1973; B. Ramm, A Christian View of Science and Scripture, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954; W. Heisenberg, Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science, New York: Harper, 1958; H. P. Owen, Concepts of Deity, New York: Herder, 1971; H. Meynell, God and the World: The Coherence of Christian Theism, London: 1971; J. Macquarrie, Principles of Christian Theology, London: SCM, 2nd ed., 1977; L. Duane Thurman, How to Think about Evolution and Other Bible-Science Controversies, Downers Grove: IVP, 2nd ed. 1978; R. M. Frye, ed., Is God a Creationist? New York: Scribners, 1983; A. Montagu, ed., Science and Creationism, London: Oxford University Press, 1984.

2.   Providence

Aquinas saw God as the sustaining cause that is present to all creatures. Calvin saw providence as a continuation of creation, and interpreted the sovereignty of God to mean that all things happen according to the express will of God. The Presbyterian liberal theologian, John Oman, criticized Calvin's standpoint for being too mechanistic, drawing on models of power and physics instead of personality. Barth criticizes Calvin for failing to develop a

Christ-centered understanding of providence. Berkouwer's view attempts to restate the biblical emphasis on the sovereignty of God without falling into the extremes of the divine determinism of hyper-Calvinism and the deism of an approach like Oman's which sees providence as God letting man learn by his mistakes.

Aquinas, Summa Theologiae I, QQ 19-26; Calvin, Institutes I, 16-18; J. Oman, Grace and Personality, Cambridge University Press, 1917; H. Heppe, op. cit., 251-280; G. C. Berkouwer, The Providence of God, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952; E. Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, Dogmatics II, 148-192; J. Daane, The Freedom of God: A Study of Election and Pulpit, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973; K. Barth, Church Dogmatics III, 3, 3-288; H. H. Farmer, The World and God, London: Nisbec, 1935; Colin Brown, Miracles and the Critical Mind, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984; D. A. Carson, Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.

3.   Angels

Bultmann maintains that angels are part of the mythological world-view of the first century. For other scholars they have a positive place in God's created order. The identity of Satan and demons.

K. Barth, Church Dogmatics III, 3, 369-531; E. Brunner, op. cit., II, 133-147; J. Danielou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, I, Chicago: Regnery, 1964 (see index): H. Bietenhard and P. J. Budd, "Angel," NIDNTT I, 101-105; H. Bietenhard, C. Brown, J. S. Wright, "Satan, Beelzebul, Devil, Exorcism," NIDNTT III, 468-477; H. Bietenhard, "Demon, air, Cast Out," NIDNTT I, 449-454; J. Macquarrie, op. cit., 215-218; F. Sontag, The God of Evil: An Argument from the Existence of the Devil, New York: Harper, 1970.

IV. Man and the Fall

1.   Man

Man can be described functionally in terms of the various academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, biology, economics. Christianity claims that over and above these descriptions of man man needs theological interpretation and evaluation. Man was made in the image of God. Traditionally this has been understood to mean that man, like God, is possessed of a rational intelligence, feelings and a will. He is capable of responding to his fellow man and to God in a way that other creatures are not. Barth, however, suggests that the image is the male-female relationship. This reverses his earlier idea that the divine image was completely lost through sin. Paul Jewett endorses Barth's later approach, though he criticizes Barth for construing the image too much in terms of the husband-wife relationship rather than the male-female relationship generally. This understanding brought about a radical rethinking of human relationships in the Christian era, and raises the question of whether its implications have yet been fully grasped.

Traditionally Adam was understood as the original male parent ancestor of the human race. This idea was called in question by the study of evolution and anthropology. F. D. Maurice and, more recently, Karl Barth have insisted that mankind should not be viewed as existing primarily in Adam but in Christ. This means that men in general are "in Christ" already for both Maurice and Barth.

M. Friedman, To Deny our Nothingness: Contemporary Images of Man, London:
Gollancz, 1967; R. L. Shinn, Man: The New Humanism, Philadelphia:
Westminster, 1968; A. R. Vidler, F. D. Maurice and Company: Nineteenth
Century Studies, London: SCM, 38-61; G. C. Berkouwer, Man: The Image of God,
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962; K. Barth, Church Dogmatics, III, 2, Edinburgh:
T. &. T. Clark, 1960; K. Barth, Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans
5, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 6, Edinburgh: Oliver and
Boyd, 1956; R. Bultmann, "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5," in W.
Klassen and G. F. Snyder, eds., Current Issues in New Testament Interpreta-
tion, New York: Harper, 1962, 143-165; R. Bultmann, "Adam Where Art Thou?,"
in Essays Philosophical and Theological, London: SCM, 1055, 119-132; C. K.
Barrett, From First Adam to Last, London: SPCK, 1962; E. K. V. Pearce, Who
was Adam?, Exeter: Paternoster, 1969; R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological
Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings, Leiden: Brill, 1971; P. K.
Jewett, Man as Male and Female: A Study of Sexual Relationships from a
Theological Point of View, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975; D. J. A. Clines,
"The Image of God in Man," Tyndale Bulletin 19, 1968, 53-103; L. Köhler,
Hebrew Man, London: SCM, 1956; H. W. Wolff, Anthropology of the Old
Testament, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974; W. Pannenberg, Anthropology in
Theological Perspective, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.

2. Evil, the Fall and Sin

Theology ascribes sin to the fall of Adam, but how is the fall to be
understood? The Eden story suggests the prior existence of evil with its
picture of the serpent and the existence of the tree of the knowledge of good
and evil. Pelagius understood sin as following the example of Adam.
Augustine taught that the fall of Adam affected all Adam's posterity in an
organic way. Tillich sees estrangement at the root of the human condition,
but he explains this as the result of the transition from essence to exist-
ence. H. R. Niebuhr accused Tillich of making the fall coincide with crea-
tion. Process theology approaches the problem of evil by positing that
creatures determine themselves and each other. God shares in suffering and
constantly works to overcome evils from within this world.

Augustine saw evil as an absence of the good. In modern times Barth developed
a theodicy which construes evil as "nothingness." It is that which God has
rejected. As such it has no substantial existence. Post-Reformation
Calvinism spoke of the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. It held
that God's promises to Adam implied a covenant under which Adam was promised
eternal life on condition of perfect obedience. Barth replaced this idea by
the concept of one covenant of grace which included all mankind in virtue of
the inclusive human nature of Jesus Christ in whom God and man are united.
Evil is the absurd nothingness that lies outside this reality and which some-
how seeks to disrupt it. J. Hick has attempted an alternative account of evil
which seeks to appeal to modern man by obviating a historical fall and also
giving reasons why evil should be necessary. For him God has created the best
of all possible worlds in so far as God has created the kind of world in which
autonomous creatures may grow personally and morally through their experience
of hardship and making choices. He claims that this theodicy was anticipated
by Irenaeus. The world is essentially a vale of soul-making. G. C. Berkouwer
restates the orthodox concept of sin. Original sin is known through our in-
volvement in sin. He rejects concepts of estrangement and alienation which

eliminate guilt. Evil is an enigma which cannot be explained. God's wrath is seen in the service of his grace. His mercy is revealed in his intolerance of sin. Christ is the theme and starting point for us now (Rom. 5). While Adam is seen as the darkness, Christ is the light which has now come.

K. Barth, Church Dogmatics, III, 3, 289-368; G. C. Berkouwer, The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956; G. C. Berkouwer, Sin, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971; F. R. Tennant, The Concept of Sin, Cambridge University Press, 1912; F. R. Tennant, Philosophical Theology, II, Cambridge University Press, 1937, 180-208; N. P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study, London: Longmans, 1927; H. Hepppe, op. cit., 281-370; E. Brunner, Dogmatics, II, 89-132; P. Tillich, Systematic Theology, II, Part III, I (Eng. ed. pp. 21-111); B. Martin, Paul Tillich's Doctrine of Man, Digswell Place: Nisbet, 1966; D. Griffin, God, Power and Evil: A Process Theodicy, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976; J. Hick, Evil and the God of Love, 2nd ed., London: Macmillan, 1977; A. C. Plantinga, God, Freedom and Evil, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974; M. B. Ahern, The Problem of Evil, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971; N. Pike, ed., God and Evil: Readings on the Theological Problem of Evil, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1964; J. Cowburn, Shadows and the Dark: The Problem of Suffering and Evil, London: SCM, 1979; Stephen T. Davies, ed., Encountering Evil: Live Options in Theodicy, Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982; J. Bowker, Problems of Suffering in Religions of the World, Cambridge University Press, 1970; P. Ricoeur, The Symbolism of Evil, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

General Books

D. G. Bloesch, Essentials of Evangelical Theology, I-II, San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978-79; H. Berkhof, Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Study of the Faith, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979; W. A. Elwell, ed., Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973; O. Weber, Foundations of Dogmatics, I, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981; Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology, I-III, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983-85; F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 2nd ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1974; Colin Brown, ed., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, I-III, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-78.

Assignment

Students will be graded on the basis of the following three course requirements:

(i)   Mid-term Examination (20%)

(ii) Essay (30%)

(iii) Lecture notes and critical responses (50%)

The mid-term examination will be held in class during the first class-hour of the sixth week of the quarter. It will be an essay-type examination in which students will be expected to write on two questions out of a choice of subjects treated in the previous weeks in class.

For fuller details of the assignments see the separate notes on Course Requirements for Dr. Brown's Courses in Systematic Theology.

Essays should be written on one of the following subjects:

1.   Discuss the doctrine of the impassibility of God.

2.   Examine the idea of God in Process Theology.

3.   Critically examine the idea of God in the teaching of any theologian that you have studied. (Note: the choice of theologian must be first approved by Dr. Brown before beginning work on this essay.)

4.   Attempt a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity for today.

5.   How do you understand the doctrine of creation in the light of biblical study and modern science?

6.   Discuss the implications of the claim that man was made in the image of God.

7.   What do you understand by the providence of God?

8.   What place have angels, Satan and demons in a contemporary theology?

9.   How do you related the concepts of evil, original sin and guilt?

Fuller Theological Seminary

Course Requirements for Dr. Brown's Courses in Systematic Theology
Revised, Fall 1984

The purpose of these notes is to set out details of the course requirements for Dr. Brown's courses in Systematic Theology I, II, and III (TH511, TH512, and TH513). The basic requirements are the same in all three courses. They grow out of the conviction that systematic theology is not primarily the construction of a system but the disciplined review of the main articles of Christian belief, based on Scripture, relating belief to thought and practice. Systematic theology involves factual knowledge of Scripture, exegesis, historical theology and philosophy, and the ability to ask the right questions and to apply relevant knowledge to those questions.

1. Basic Requirements

For each course there will be <u>three</u> basic requirements carrying the following percentages of the total points:

> (i)   Mid-term examination (20%)
>
> (ii) Essay (30%)
>
> (iii) Lecture notes with critical responses (50%)

<u>Students must complete all three requirements in order to receive credit for the course. This applies to those taking the course Credit/No Credit.</u>

The final course grade will be determined as follows:

90% and above	A
81-89%	A-
76-80%	B+
70-75%	B
66-69%	B-
60-65%	C+
50-59%	C
49% and below	NC

2. Deadlines and Penalties

(a) Fall, Winter and Spring Quarters

The <u>mid-term examination</u> will be an hour-long examination held in class during the first class-hour of the sixth week of the quarter.

The <u>essay</u> should be submitted to Dr. Brown's office by 9 a.m. of the Monday of the eighth week of the quarter.

Lecture notes are due on Friday of examination week no later than 4 p.m.

(b)   Intensive Summer School Courses

In intensive Summer School courses the examination will be held on the Monday of the second week of the course. The essay will be due on the Monday following the end of the course. The lecture notes will be due on the Friday two weeks from the end of the course.

If the Registrar requires any alteration of this time table, notice will be given at the beginning of the course.

(c)   Penalties

All students are required to take the examination and submit the essay and lecture notes in order to gain credit for the course.

5 points will be deducted for each week that either the essay or the notes are late.

3.   Guidelines

(a)   Mid-Term Examination

Students will be required to write a series of short answers on questions which test their knowledge of subjects treated in class. Students who have re-worked their class notes after each class should have no diffi-culty with the test.

(b)   Essay   *2/3 exposition / 1/3 self*

The essay will be based on one of the topics given in the course outline. The purpose of the essays is to provide opportunity to examine a subject in depth which is of particular concern to the student. The essay should serve as a model for investigation in other areas of the subject.

Essays should be typed. They should be approximately 15 pages of double-spaced typing, exclusive of footnotes.

For style and format, students should consult Kate L. Turabian, Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations (Chicago University Press).

Students should leave a wide margin and insert sub-headings.

Footnotes should be numbered and placed at the end. Footnotes should contain two kinds of information: (1) references to literature; (2) brief explanations of points, where necessary. Such explanations may be given in footnotes only when the argument would sidetrack the reader from the main point that the author is developing.

References to literature should be given in the format described by Turabian.

Biblical references should be given in parenthesis in the main body of the text.

As a general rule, essays should contain two-thirds exposition and one-third critical comment. The aim of the essay should be stated simply and clearly at the beginning. The introduction should contain a statement of how the writer proposes to develop the theme and argue the case. The conclusion should contain a summary and assessment. Critical comment should not be confined to the conclusion. Students should critically evaluate points as they go along, and bring their conclusions together in the final assessment.

In grading consideration will be given to content, argument, format, presentation, grammar and spelling.

The bibliography should contain a list of the works consulted. Footnotes are more important than bibliographies. They indicate whether the student has used a work intelligently. Bibliographies merely show ability to copy titles.

(c) Lecture Notes

The rationale of this requirement is bound up with several considerations: (1) the need to have a good, useful set of notes, that will contain a theological foundation for future ministry; (2) the sheer value of producing good, clear, serviceable notes; (3) the need to maximize the value of time spent in the classroom by producing something of lasting value and by reflecting thoughtfully and critically on the lecture material and class discussion.

Notes should be set out in 2 clearly marked sections:

(i) Lecture Material

This section should contain the notes for all classes in the quarter. Pages should be numbered. Headings and sub-headings should be used, together with a wide margin.

(ii) Critical Comments

These should be kept in a separate section, but cross-referenced to the particular subjects treated in class.

This should contain the student's own response to the issues discussed in class, stating why the student agrees or disagrees with the viewpoints discussed. Students will be assessed here not by whether they agree or disagree with any particular view but by the incisiveness of their comments and discussion.

This section provides students with the opportunity to identify issues where they believe that they need to give further thought and to formulate questions that need to be answered.

In this section students preparing for ministry may take the opportunity to include reflection on the practical implications of ideas and issues for ministry.

The total length of the comments should not be less than 15 pages. There is no upper limit. Students may limit their comments to 5 topics of their own choice.

Experience suggests that, to get the best out of any class, it is best to spend some time going over it as soon after the class as possible. The re-working of notes is one excellent way of revision and learning. Notes should be grammatical and coherent. Points will be deducted for bad grammar, incorrect spelling, and poor presentation.

The critical responses should be typewritten, but the lecture notes may be submitted in a handwritten form, provided that they are clear, well organized and coherent. However, in view of the value of working over notes and producing them in a typewritten form 15% of the total possible points for the course are allocated to the typewritten presentation of notes. Points for the lecture notes will be divided as follows:

	Maximum Possible
Class notes	20
Presentation of class notes in typewritten form	15
Typewritten critical comments	15
Total	50

4. [Credo]

Students who are completing their third and last course in Systematic Theology may opt to write a Credo or personal statement of belief in lieu of all other course requirements. The Credo should be at least 30 pages long. It should contain a statement of belief concerning the main doctrines covered in all three Systematic Theology courses.

5. Return of Students' Work

All work should have an attached, self-addressed, green Inter-Campus Student Box Delivery Slip. Work which does not have such a slip attached will not be returned.

To: Box:
From: Quarter:
Course: Grade:

The following items caused you to lose points. Where the grader has put one of the following numbers against some part of your work, it means that your work was defective in this respect. The quality of your future work will be improved, if you pay attention to this matter.

I.   Content

1   The paper did not address the topic   _____

2   Lack or weak use of supporting evidence or argument   _____

3   The paper paid inadequate attention to alternative   _____
     viewpoints

4   The paper did not deal with all the relevant issues   _____

5   Discussion irrelevant to the question   _____

6   Argument dependent on secondary sources   _____

7   Sweeping, unsupported statements   _____

8   Uncritical use of proof-texts   _____

9   Plagiarism, i.e. passing off as your own the ideas of   _____
     others

II.   Format

10   Spelling and/or grammar need attention   _____

11   Use of slang and/or colloquial expressions,   _____
     inappropriate in an essay

12   References given in an improper form   _____

13   The paper was not the required length   _____

14   The paper lacked a clear statement of aim and/or   _____
     conclusion

15   Insert appropriate headings to indicate the direction   _____
     and development of your argument

16   Write clear English; avoid technical jargon and   _____
     highfalutin language

17   Use wider margins and/or more space between paragraphs   _____

18   Use a clean typewriter   _____

III. Other Comments